NEHRU MEMORIAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY

ORAL HISTORY TRANSCRIPT

Shri T.T. Krishnamachari

FOREWORD

190

1. The literary property rights in this transcript have been donated by Shri T.T. Vasu to the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. To facilitate the research use of the interview it has been decided that persons wishing to publish short quotations from this transcript do not have to obtain the permission of either Shri T.T. Vasu or the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. While a precise and consistently applicable definition of "short quotations" is impossible, it should be understood that the allowable length of published excerpt is similar to that which is commonly permitted under the legal doctrine of "fair use" of material that is protected by statutory copyright.

2. This transcript may not be copied or duplicated in any way without the permission of the Director of the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

3. The transcript may not be deposited in another library or used by anyone other than the person to whom it was given by the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

4. Permission to quote extensive segments of the transcript must be obtained through the Director of the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

5. The suggested citation for information contained in the transcript is:

Shri T.T. Krishnamachari (interviewee), recorded by

Dr. H.D. Sharma (Interviewer), date, page,

Nehru Memorial Museum & Library,
Oral History Project.

NEHRU MEMORIAL MUSEUM & LIBRARY
TEEN MURTI HOUSE, NEW DELHI-11. TELEPHONES : 375026, 375197 GRAMS : NEHRUMUSUM

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

DECLARATION

I agree that the material recorded by my father late Shri T.T. Krishnamachari for the Oral History Project of the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library may be used for historical research or dissemination of historical information in such ways as may be determined by the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, including publication and broadcast either by them direct or by the research scholars making use of the material.

This transcript may be read in such places as is made available for purposes of research by the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Quotations from or citations of this transcript may be made only with written permission of the Director, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

No reproduction of this transcript either in whole or any part may be made by any device, except by the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

Sd/-
T.T. Vasu
18 May 1974

Bio-data

Krishnamachari, T.T.: B. 26 Nov. 1899; educ. Madras; Member, Madras Legislative Assembly (1937); Member, Central Legislative Assembly (1942); Member, Constituent Assembly (1946); Central Minister of Iron and Steel. (1955-57); Central Minister of Finance (1956-1958) but had to resign over Mundra affairs (1958); Central Minister without portfolio (1962); Central Minister of Finance (1963-65); died. 7 March 1974.

Main points covered in the interview

Appointment as member of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly; contribution by different members of the Committee; controversy over the language and property questions; Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of State Policy; contribution of Nehru in the making of the constitution; relationship between the State and the Centre; influences of other constitutions; powers of the President; first encounter with Nehru; T.T.K's political life; Nehru's relationship with his colleagues; process of decision-making in the cabinet; Nehru as a parliamentarian; Nehru's understanding of India's financial and economic problems and socialism; Nehru's approach towards religion; Nehru and the Opposition; Nehru's relation with the President; Nehru's attitude towards Preventive Detention Act; T.T.K's philosophy of life; T.T.K's ideals, his political career in the cabinet and his subsequent withdrawl from politics; influence of religion and spiritualism in T.T.K's life.

Oral History Interview
with
Shri T.T. Krishnamachari
Madras, India
March 27, 1973
by
Dr. Hari Dev Sharma
for The Nehru Memorial Museum and Library

Hari Dev Sharma: Mr. T.T.K., could you tell us how were you nominated to the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly?

T.T. Krishnamachari: It was an accident. The man who was there before me, whose place I took, was a businessman from Calcutta, D.P. Khaitan. Why he was nominated initially, I do not know, but he died. It happened, the Vice-President of the Assembly, Dr. H.C.Mookherjee and I were good friends. Dr. Rajendra Prasad was ill and could not preside over the Constituent Assembly meetings. It was Dr.Mookherjee who was presiding in the earlier days. I used to assist him in his work, and it made him suggest to the powers that be that I may be put into the vacancy in the Drafting Committee.

Sharma: Would you tell us about the drafting of the Constitution?

Krishnamachari: The main draft was made by Sir B.N. Rau. It followed the pattern of the Govern-

ment of India Act of 1935 with slight variations. The draft Constitution which we had before us, we departed from it very radically in many respects, but the framework was still what Sir B. N. Rau produced.

Sharma: What was the contribution made by different members?

Krishnamachari: It is a very difficult thing to assess. So far as the Drafting Committee itself was concerned, most of them were lawyer members excepting myself, in the sense, they had a law degree. Dr. Ambedkar was a Professor of Law and a practising lawyer; Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar was Advocate-General of Madras and a distinguished lawyer; Kanaiyalal Munshi was one of the distinguished lawyers; N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar was a distinguished administrator; Saadulla from Assam - he was Chief Minister there but he came primarily because he was a Muslim representative. The then Indian states had a representative and Madhava Rau, who was Dewan in Mysore, became another representative, and as I said before, my coming in the place of Khaitan was an accident. So, it was an odd body brought together and the contribution is very, very difficult

to assess at this period of time. One continuing element in the Drafting Committee was myself because I was unemployed, my time was entirely at the Drafting Committee's disposal and since I became a member of the Drafting Committee, I had a diary where I remember to have put in about 4014 hours of work on the Drafting Committee and its ancillaries. So, I was probably the one continuing element in the Drafting Committee, but very largely it was Ambedkar and myself, to some extent, Munshi came in now and again, Gopalaswami exerted some influence, Alladi Krishnaswami spoke on law as and when he liked and that is about it all. But it was not so much the Drafting Committee. We had the members of the Cabinet, the Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Both took a keen interest in the drafting. I was the man who used to meet them very often and we took our new drafts to the party meetings. It was really the Congress Party but then the Constituent Assembly was largely the Congress Party and nobody else. You might say that influence of Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel was there dominantly and their influence was felt in cases of articles which were controversial. Then others too, I think, they knew all about it.

Sharma: What was your special contribution?

Krishnamachari: I had a background of knowledge of constitutional law. I did a lot of additional work in looking up the records of the framing of the American Constitution, the founding fathers' work; the way the difficulties that had been faced by Canada, by Australia; the difficulties faced by Germany, the Weimar Constitution. In fact it was the difficulties faced by Germany in the Weimar Constitution that gave me the idea for these emergency provisions in the Constitution. They were largely framed on that experience because there was a book on that subject called Constitutional Dictatorship by Rassi. We borrowed very largely from it. My contribution, I think, if I may say so in all humility, has been very significant because I had put in a lot of hard work behind it, both study as well as work, and I was deeply involved in it. I was interested in it. I had no other interest at the moment and, whether it is on record or not, I feel that my contribution is quite significant.

Sharma: It is quite interesting that you were a businessman and you were also interested

in the making of the Constitution. How did this interest start?

Krishnamachari: You see I was a businessman and I gave up my business in 1942. But all the time that I was a businessman, I had some kind of intellectual life apart from my business interests. I was a reader and I had a private library of a considerable size and in those days everybody thought of the future of India, the time we would get our liberty and frame our own constitution. So, it happened somewhere in 1928 that a group of young people, a few friends of mine and I, started reading about the constitution. So, I had collected quite a lot of literature even before the odd chance brought me to the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly.

Sharma: Had you tried to draft some sort of a constitution at that time?

Krishnamachari: No. We had various things before us. We had Sivaswami Aiyar, who had written something about it: of course the Simon Report was there; we had the Motilal Nehru Committee Report. There were other such attempts at drafting constitutions. I had a complete literature of all that

was ~~a~~ written by Indian leaders and well-wishers of India, ~~xxxxxxx~~ and also whatever efforts the British had put behind it. That was all within my knowledge. One could have read every piece of literature on this subject.

Sharma: The Drafting Committee was an assorted group. Ideologically they were not one. Did it present some problems?

Krishnamachari: It did present some problems because sometimes conflicts came, but since the government, rather members of the ~~g~~ government, were intimately connected with the constitution-making, Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel, things were smoothened over. I had access to both of them, free access to both of them, and whenever we were in difficulty, I went to them. We used to discuss it in the party meetings and we had also various sub-committees meetings, not officially so recognised, but ad hoc committees, with the President, Rajendra Babu, people like the Sardar, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Govind Ballabh Pant and a few other people. They were all there. Of course, we had a lot of trouble over a number of chapters of the Constitution. Language, for instance, involved a very large

amount of trouble, and then article 31 as it ultimately emerged, property clause. There again there was a vital difference of opinion amongst the people who were in control. The Drafting Committee had to take into account all this happening, produced a draft, produced a revised draft, produced the fourth draft, the fifth draft, to provide some kind of a compromise now and again. It was the life during 1949, the year in which most of the work was done. So, to me constitution-making was my life, nothing else.

Sharma: These two issues, i.e. the language question and the property question, they have been very controversial right from that time. What were the ideas of the framers of the Constitution?

Krishnamachari: I can tell you so far as Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana (Abul Kalam) and Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, people of that type of thinking, they felt that India should have two languages, English and Hindi. But there was a very large Hindi lobby there and curiously enough, the Sardar took up the side of the Hindi lobby and one man who stood out against any compromise on that matter was

Purushottam Das Tandon. He did not agree even to the final draft as it emerged. It was not a compromise but patch work. But events that happened later on have shown that the ideas which Jawaharlal had on this subject were, perhaps, wiser.

Sharma: And about the property clause?

Krishnamachari: The property clause, the original clause, was a simple one which I liked. The original clause merely said that no property should be acquired for the purpose of the state except by a process of law and that had left things alone. Public opinion would determine the nature of compensation that should be given, type of compensation and so on. There is the Common Law and public opinion which includes the Common Law, would have determined. Curiously enough, whether he did it on his own or he did it because the Sardar asked him, the man who objected to this article was John Matthai who came into the cabinet as a socialist but he refused to accept that particular article. Then started the compromise. The compromise that emerged, something in which Sir B.N. Rau, myself, Govind Ballabh Pant, Kanaiyalal Munshi, Gopalaswami Ayyangar, all of us, had something to do with it. But in the sequel it

did not work because it has been amended again. It has been amended umpteen times thereafter so that what the intentions of the original framers were, have just gone to the wind.

Sharma: What was Jawaharlal Nehru's...?

Krishnamachari: Jawaharlal Nehru also felt that the original draft was good, to allow public opinion to determine the course of things, and anyway a compromise..... I don't think Jawaharlal believed that property should be taken away by the state without paying anything as a compensation to the people so dispossessed, but he did not want it to become a matter that, perhaps, he could perceive as something where courts went into the question of the market price or the possible market price and so on. He thought it better to leave it alone. Of course, naturally, we never intended that the Constitution should not be within the purview of the courts. There was no attempt at any stage to bar the courts from jurisdiction with regard to interpreting the Constitution. That was broadly the view of Jawaharlal, but other people wanted safeguards, particularly the Sardar, and that was why the amended article 31 came in.

Sharma: What were the fundamental principles on which the founding fathers of the Constitution agreed?

Krishnamachari: At that time I was not a member of the Drafting Committee, but a number of sub-committees were appointed as soon as the Constituent Assembly met some time in December 1946 for various purposes. The Muslim League did not co-operate and the first five or six months of the Constituent Assembly were one of suspense, the committees worked but one did not know what it was going to be ultimately excepting that they had the draft Constitution of B.N. Rau before them and the various committees' reports. It was only after the decision to accept the partition, when the work of the Constituent Assembly became concrete and in a way integrated them. Practically you can say that nothing much was done towards the Constitution till August-September, 1948. Other sub-committees were appointed like the States Finance Commission when the States integration took place. The states integration took place in a sort of a tense atmosphere. Just before India got independence, the states had to be sort of fitted in. A lot of things had happened then. The constitution-

making was bypassed for the time being and we only started again some time in September 1948. The real work of the Constituent Assembly was only in 1949.

Sharma: What were the fundamental principles?

Krishnamachari: The principles had been laid down. There had to be a Bill of Rights, which were called the Fundamental Rights, and then there were the Directive Principles about which there is so much of talk. I say the Directive Principles have been divided from the Fundamental Rights and, I think, the division was very marked and clear. It is something like this: In the Human Rights Commission of the U.N., curiously enough, the communist countries wanted that all the rights should be put together whereas the democratic countries wanted them to be differentiated between the justiceable rights and non-justiceable rights, and, therefore, in the Human Rights Commission, the rights that are dealt with are two sets of rights, justiceable and non-justiceable. In fact, I think, the pattern of thinking was much on the same lines here. The Fundamental Rights were justiceable. The Directive Principles of State

Policy was a thing which should guide state policy. They wanted the right to work. Well, if you give the right to work and make it justiceable, the state has not got the resources and they cannot provide them work. The same thing was with regard to prohibition. There is in the Directive Principles, prohibition, but prohibition many states probably would not introduce. Some states which had introduced prohibition have taken it away. If you say there is a Fundamental Right, it is a justiceable right, then you can get the courts to decide on it, it becomes impossible. So, there is a basis for difference. Of course, modern thinking, modern interpretation seems to sort of blur the dividing line between the two, but that was not so at the time. That was precise and the differences between the two were considered to be quite radical.

<u>Sharma:</u> Did the Drafting Committee also think that the Fundamental Rights could be amended by the Parliament?

<u>Krishnamachari:</u> As a matter of fact, that is something I would not like to say now as the case is <u>sub judice</u>, but so far as my impression is concerned, no parts of the Constitution were beyond the scope

of amendment. There were some people who did want to say something, this should not be done, that should not be done, but ultimately when they imposed a two-thirds majority for amendment, it was accepted as sufficient safeguard.

Sharma: What was Nehru's specific contribution towards the making of the Constitution?

Krishnamachari: Well, in one sense it was all pervasive. He made a significant contribution in regard to this question of public worship and religion, right to convert. He said it had to be allowed to be free. The Christian community was very keen on it. Similarly, equality before law was one of the things on which he was very keen, and also the general Fundamental Rights, chapter 19. He had a keen interest in article 19 and its clauses. Of course, he took an interest in the property clause. The other things he did not worry himself about. The other parts of the Constitution like distribution of powers of finance, this, that and things of this sort, they were left more or less to the people, committees were appointed, and to the experts and to the Drafting Committee, and for the consideration of the Chief Ministers and so on. He had broadly,

for instance, an interest in language. His interest was all pervasive, but then there was something specific also. Wherever the question of a personal matter came in, personal rights, the question of minorities, you could always depend that Jawaharlal would side with the minority. His contributions were material, not something to be brushed aside. He always came in when there was some difficulty and more than Jawaharlal, Patel dominated the scene, made people fall in line. For instance, his protection to the services, the question of the princes and on various other important matters Patel had a mind of his own. He came and spoke to the Assembly. He spoke pretty freely. You wanted something to be categorically done, and the Sardar was available for it. He never minced matters. So far as Jawaharlal was concerned, he was different. His outlook was different. His approach to problems was totally different. But being the man who was a liaison between the Constituent Assembly and the government, between the Drafting Committee and the government, I went to whomsoever I wanted for the time being, either to Jawaharlal Nehru or to Sardar Patel.

Sharma: What was Nehru's approach?

Krishnamachari: So far as Nehru was concerned, his attitude to life was not one of black and white, room for different shades of grey.... He was more catholic, more tolerant and sometimes probably not very effective because of that, but so far as the Sardar was concerned, if he felt a particular thing was right, he would sledge-hammer. Matters were left very largely to the Drafting Committee. Take the question of three schedules, they were left to the Drafting Committee, the transitory provisions and other provisions, the question of definitions, all these were left to the Drafting Committee, which meant very largely to me because I was the man who was working in detail. We had a Secretary. When the Secretary left, we had a draftsman, Joint Secretary, a remarkable man, and I think if anybody has to be remembered for the making of the Constitution, S.N. Mukherjee, who was Joint Secretary and the chief draftsman of the Constituent Assembly, should be remembered. His help was something which has never been properly acknowledged, but I happen to know what it was, and to have been working largely with his help, a very cheerful man, working very hard, late into the night, 12 o'clock in the night, getting things ready. Sometimes we had a little difficulty, most

of the time we did not, and as the time went on towards the end of the thing, when the two major issues like language and property were over, people got tired and left it to the Drafting Committee.

Sharma: What was the view about the State and Centre relationship?

Krishnamachari: These were determined by meetings between States representatives and the Centre. In fact something is being done by the budget today. I had mentioned some kind of pooling of agricultural income. I think Govind Ballabh Pant said: "What you say is rational but we are not ready for it." And very largely the details were worked out by the Drafting Committee. There were some violent speeches against the distribution of powers. For instance, a man like Ramaswami Mudaliar talked about States having enough power and I think he was one man who made a speech on that occasion. But very largely it was accepted, as a compromise and, in fact, in actual working, considering the constitutions of Australia and Canada which were the two main constitutions before us in determining the three sections of schedule 7. We were led by their difficulties and we made

changes, but the original draft, which was made by B.N. Rau, followed the pattern of the Government of India Act.

Sharma: What were the other constitutions on which you drew?

Krishnamachari: Fundamentally, you see there are two aspects of the Constitution, two influences. It was a federal constitution and, therefore, very largely the American example was before us. We had a parliamentary system and very largely the parliamentary system was the British system that governed and that is where when people now speak about the President, we had no illusions in our mind about the powers of a President. The President was only a head of state. He had no discretionary powers excepting a marginal one in the case of calling people to form the government, and now people say the President has powers. No, as a matter of fact, we distinguished the two, the powers of the President, powers of the Governor. The Governor has more powers than the President. The reason is the Governor is the agent of the Centre. The President has to be guided by the Council of Ministers. So, these two major constitutions were before us. One, the federal

aspect of it was largely borrowed from the United States and we also skipped over some of the difficulties they had. For instance, a peculiar phrase which was in the original draft Constitution, 'due process of law' was taken out on the advice of a Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, Felix Frankurter. He said: "All the litigation in United States came because of this phrase, 'due process of law'. Don't put it in." We took it out. And the parliamentary system, the question of President being something like the British monarch, acting on the advice of the Council of Ministers, that was the factor behind our brains. In part of working we took the other constitutions, Australia and Canada and the Dominion constitutions. We studied a considerable amount of literature and their difficulties were taken note of and we tried to circumvent.

Sharma: One thing, the Constitution, as it stands today, the powers of the President as laid down in the Constitution, are rather ambiguous.

Krishnamachari: My own feeling is they are not ambiguous. They are very,very clear. When you say 'President', President acting on the advice of the

Council of Ministers and nothing else. Anybody who says it is to the contrary, so far as the view of the original framers of the Constitution is concerned, I think he is doing damage to the Constitution. I am very categorical about it. In fact, on one or two occasions when some difference of opinion arose, I was privileged to intervene and tell the President at the time what his powers were.

Sharma: But it says that he will have a Council of Ministers to advise but whether he is bound to accept that advice...

Krishnamachari: Yes. He has no individuality of his own. The Council of Ministers' advice means a government mandate. The risk of responsibility is that of the Council of Ministers, not his. A President cannot be impeached for any act of his unless he defies the Constitution. The Council of Ministers is entirely responsible, he is not responsible.

Sharma: Did you foresee that the wording, as it is, could create some confusion?

Krishnamachari: We could not make it more precise excepting we left it to the convention as it is governed in England. If we had made it more precise....

~~xixax~~ As a matter of fact, I had tried to make it more precise in one particular amendment which practically denigrated the position of the President - "the President shall sign". No, nobody can ask "the President shall sign." It is understood that if the Council of Ministers felt a particular way, the President shall act in concert with them, and the wording has been rather unfortunate. The amendment has been very unfortunate and I think it goes right against the delicate nuances of the Constitution which we thought important at the time of making the Constitution.

Sharma: When did you meet Jawaharlal Nehru for the first time?

Krishnamachari: I was a member of the Constituent Assembly and we were supposed to know all the other members of the Constituent Assembly. I think I cannot say, I knew who Jawaharlal was, I knew all about him, but we never came to meet at any particular time and talk until December, 1947 when after a small, little tussle in the legislature, he invited me to meet him in his house, 17 York Road.

Sharma: What really happened in the Assembly?

Krishnamachari: I was speaking on planning and he interrupted me and I yielded first and the second time I would not yield, just the sort of things that happen in Parliament, conflicts of that nature. Anyway, he took it in good part and he asked me to meet him and I met him some time in December, I think, end of December 1947, first time and we talked for very nearly three hours that day. That was the basis of a friendship xx which lasted till his death.

Sharma: What did you discuss during these three hours?

Krishnamachari: First, he wanted to know all about me. I said, "I am not a regular politician, I am not a blue-blooded Congressman, I have not been to prison. I am a businessman who came into politics, and I have been making some noise." I suppose some portion of it filtered to him. He wanted to know something about me. Then we discussed many other things, Constitution, planning and various other things, what kind of ministers you have. It was a comprehensive survey. I was trying to put out what I had in my brain and it was a very agreeable interview. I think it lasted for two hours and fifty five minutes.

After that we did establish a rapport. I cannot say it was a very close one, it grew over a period of time. Probably it took five or six years to incubate. You never know.

Sharma: Before 1952 was there any talk about your joining the Cabinet?

Krishnamachari: Yes, there were two or three occasions and some talk about my joining the Cabinet. A couple of times an offer was made to me and those offers I rejected. Subsequently, I think when Nehru wanted to get me in, he had found some other difficulty. But that did not make any difference because even after the Constituent Assembly work was over, I had seen Nehru frequently and talked and discussed men, affairs, planning, various other things with him.

Sharma: What were the difficulties before 1952 in your joining the Cabinet?

Krishnamachari: I cannot really say. If anything, it was personal, my relationship with some of the other members of the Cabinet, maybe. In any event, I was not very keen on getting into the Cabinet. It is a very funny thing. I was not very keen on the political career as the word goes. I

was not keen in getting into the Constituent Assembly. I was not keen to go back again after 1949. In fact, I did not go on the day the Constitution was promulgated. I went about twenty days afterwards.

Sharma: This is a very curious case. You joined politics and you were not interested in politics power.

Krishnamachari: I was not. I had no power base. I was not a man with a power base behind. I just came into the District Congress Party and somehow or other made some noise and I had some opportunity to do some work, but really I was not a career politician. I did not come into politics as a person with a career. The career, as I said, came almost incidentally rather than something which I had planned.

Sharma: What were the principles governing your politics in the beginning?

Krishnamachari: I became a fulfledged politician very largely, I think, influenced by Rajagopalachari, two and a half years with him, firstly, in opposition, then with him and then the Congress govern-

ment resigned. I decided I should also give up my business very soon and become a soldier of the Congress. Nobody could think, nobody could plan anything more than that in those days, because everything was uncertain and after we got freedom, as I said, I did not have a base, I could not make my influence felt excepting by work. In fact, if I got known during the Constituent X Assembly days, it was merely because of my work in the Drafting Committee which necessitated my seeing people, talking to them. Inevitably it made me a man of some importance, somebody known and I could make a contribution, and I think Jawaharlal probably felt that here was something slightly out of the ordinary. That governed our relationship right through. If I were a pedestrian, I don't think Jawaharlal would have had much use for me.

Sharma: You were not interested in power because you were otherwordly or was there any other reason?

Krishnamachari: I can't really describe it. I think it is just a mental make-up, maybe something in my background. I did not choose it as a career. I did not have the background for it. If I had gone

to jail, I might have felt I made a sacrifice, but I had not gone to jail and essentially I was not a man with a political base, I had no political base, and I was not one of those persons who sought a godfather. No. Nehru was not my godfather. There is no question of anybody doing anything for me as such, because it was an incident.

Sharma: I am just trying to understand. Another thing which people understand that your psychological make-up is such that you are a person with a tremendous ego and you do not want to play a second fiddle. Was that the reason that you wanted to be either at the top or nowhere?

Krishnamachari: It was not a question of the top because I never aspired to be the Prime Minister of India. This is not with the top. I had a particular position, you may call it ego, if you like, but I had collected odd bits of knowledge, hard work, varied experience in the world. It is essentially a sort of what you call 'ego' I had, but an ego entirely under control. I never allowed my ego to sort of run away with my life and that is why I can say very frankly that my public life has been very clean, a clean public life. As a public man, I knew

certain things could not be done and I did not do it. I would not take advantage of it for my personal ends. I have never done it and pleasures were not in my way. Somehow, it might be power, it might be the sense of doing something. After all many things I have done largely because of Jawaharlal Nehru or sort of blazing the trail. Nobody in India thought of a big steel programme and I started it. Same thing with industry, in a very big way. Same thing with many institutions, financial and other institutions which have been created by me. All of us felt we should build something, we are building, you are a builder now, you have an opportunity to build, you build it, and there I had a complete rapport in outlook with Jawaharlal. He had found a kindred soul. He was the Prime Minister and I was expected to do the work. So we were keen there.

Sharma: Now, how were his relations with his Cabinet colleagues?

Krishnamachari: Well, must have been different. Actually, when the Sardar was there, they probably had a lot of differences, some differences used to come out in the open. They used to talk about it, but Jawaharlal was very deferential to the Sardar, never

offended him, he always tried sort of to placate him. Gopalaswami came in. Gopalaswami was a civil servant. Somehow, he got to like him. Towards the end of Gopalaswami's career, Jawaharlal got sentimental about it - he is a fine man; he has done a fine job of work. With Maulana he had a past and he had a position, a position as an old Congressman, as a Muslim. But with Pant it was something very close. He did not want to bring Pant into the Cabinet for a very long time and finally when he decided, Pant was very close to him. But Pant never exercised the last influence, no. He was always influenced by Jawaharlal. I had the privilege of working closely with those two people. Sometimes we three sat together xmd until 1958, but Pant had the dominance in spite of the fact that he never laid down the law, he had a dominant influence on Jawaharlal, you cannot deny it. It was a good influence too. After Pant's death, I don't know what happened to him. For about a year I was only a casual visitor to Delhi but he did ask me to come back because he felt that he wanted me there. So, his relations with colleagues with whom he worked were like something very pleasant ones, pleasant, personal, affectionate.

Sharma: How were the decisions in the Cabinet arrived at? Was it the Prime Minister who had the last word?

Krishnamachari: Prime Minister has always the last word. We rarely took a vote excepting on a few crucial occasions, rarely took a vote. In fact, one of the things, that was before me, on which a vote was taken and decided by one vote was the question of giving up rationing in 1947. Jawaharlal was against it and the vote of Shanmukham went with the Sardar, and they decided. But in my experience of the Cabinet, we rarely took a vote. Sometimes we did, but very rarely. And Jawaharlal did not brush aside his colleagues' views but sometimes probably he would say, "It is not of much consequence". But if the colleague was strong enough to say, 'No', it should be considered. My position was that I was rarely overruled. Once or twice I was overruled, I offered my resignation. In 1953, the sugar decontrol, I was against it. So was Deshmukh. I offered my resignation. Jawaharlal himself was with me, but he did not think it very necessary to go against Kidwai. But then he took some time, he came and explained it to me. He met me, wrote to me. He said: "No, you can't resign on this issue."

So, the approach to his colleagues was, so far as my experience goes, very democratic.

Sharma: Was there any time when the Prime Minister was outvoted?

Krishnamachari: As a matter of fact I will tell you one particular thing about the Bank Award. We were even outvoted. If Mr. Giri had voted with us, he would not have resigned. We were outvoted. They are not essential things, you know whether to accept the Award in part. Ultimately, what we thought of doing did happen. We appointed another man to look into it again. I don't think Jawaharlal made it a personal factor, no. And this is something very important, because I don't think anybody really insisted. He used to have talks with people. In fact, in my later years, I always had a discussion with him on the subject before the Cabinet and I rarely opened my mouth in the Cabinet. Let him say what he wanted. Sometimes we went together, sometimes I discussed the Cabinet papers with him. May be others did it. Another man who was fairly close to him was Lal Bahadur in later years and quite possibly he discussed with him too. But it was a democratic process. He did not say: "Ah, the Prime

Minister thinks the other way, so you have no hope." In fact once or twice with some suggestion that I had put forward, Deshmukh did not agree and ultimately they were accepted, but Jawaharlal did not force Deshmukh to accept them. He took three years before they were accepted.

Sharma: What was that?

Krishnamachari: Nationalisation, things of that sort..... So, his attitude towards colleagues was a friendly one. He treated the Cabinet as a family. Of course, there were individuals, I cannot say very much about his relationship with Krishna Menon and his influence over him because when Krishna Menon came in, very soon xxxxx after that I left. When I came back, very soon thereafter, Krishna Menon left. So, we were not there together for long.

Sharma: So, you would not be able to say much on Krishna Menon's influence?

Krishnamachari: No, I can't.

Sharma: What was this process of decision-making? How did you arrive at decisions?

Krishnamachari: You see the normal processes

were rarely bypassed. I can tell you how he worked as a Minister for External Affairs. Sometimes he wanted something else done, but he had to give it up, a viable thing. In External Affairs he was served by some very good men. The first man that served under him was Girija Shankar Bajpai. Though Girja Shankar Bajpai was a man who came from the civil service and was supposed to be pro-British and all that, Jawaharlal developed a great respect for him, for his intelligence. The next name that made an impact on him was N.R. Pillai, and the third man was M.J. Desai, and he had Khera as Cabinet Secretary. He also had a lot of influence over him. But he was not a man who was sort of like a bull in a china shop, went in and said: "Ah, do something else." No. All that was only for the outside. So far as administration was concerned, he did conform to patterns though he made his impact on it. He changed things. He could draft himself. He could redraft, he was a fine draftsman. He had drafted all the Working Committee resolutions. He sometime sat down and drafted important things. And decision-making was not something which was sort of by fits and starts. The ordinary process was there.

Sharma: What I meant was, was he a person with an open mind or did he have ideological blinkers?

Krishnamachari: No, I do not think he had ideological blinkers. No. He rebelled against things, he rebelled against injustice, he rebelled against people being made poor, he rebelled against ill-treatment. All that was there, but in the matter of administration, he had no blinkers there. I mean not to my knowledge.

Sharma: He had an open mind on problems?

Krishnamachari: Well, to the extent that you can. He preferred compromise and often times he told me when I was very hard, he told me: "No, TT, the thing is that when you do something, you ought to compromise. You ought to give in."

Sharma: Now, in positions like this when he had to compromise, was it at the cost of principles?

Krishnamachari: No, I do not think he would compromise on principles. It was merely procedural.

Sharma: Compromise on procedure?

Krishnamachari: Procedural, probably matters of detail. I do not think, there was any compromise on principle excepting probably sometimes he waited for action. He said: "All right, we will put it off." For instance, we thought of nationalisation of State Bank and insurance in 1952. Well, the colleagues were not quite prepared for it. So, it came in 1955 or 1956. So, it was a question of postponing things. He never wanted it, he said: "Let's wait. Let it wait." So, essentially, as I have said, the humanist in him was a dominant factor. If you conceive a single point about Jawaharlal, that x man was a humanist. He revelled in being with the people of the country. He went abroad. People surrounding him, children, he used to throw garlands at x them and enjoy it. He essentially was the man of the people, he was a humanist and that was also the relationship with people who came from abroad and went back. Very polite, never rude behaviour. Sometimes, probably he was hesitant in making up his mind. Later on, they did not like some ideas of his but that is where my being with him helped. Sometimes we discussed things, we were ready for a meet-

ing, and the short period that I was not there, probably somebody did not take my place. But he was a very fine man to work with, extremely fine man to work with.

Sharma: Was he a man of action?

Krishnamachari: Yes, certainly. He certainly believed in action and many things we did. He believed in action. Well, if it happened that there was a conflict and he had to postpone, yes, he compromised on it. But he did not give it up. What all was done during his time, people may not have executed it in the proper way, but then the grand concept, planning and the various items in the plans, future development.... For instance, I mention one thing to you.

In 1963 he was going to a press conference. I gave him a piece of paper. He read it. He said: "What do you want me to do?" "I want you to announce it in the press conference." He said: "Why?" I said: "Yes, I feel that it should go as part of the press conference." I said: "We are starting a measure of social security. We are going to begin with our government servants, and we

are going to pay pensions for widows of government servants in future." Somebody asked him: "Why do you make that mention? It should be made by Finance Minister." He said: "The Finance Minister asked me to mention it." Then he asked me what it was. I said: "I want to begin some kind of social security. I want to bring in ultimately that everybody has some kind of security. It is a mere beginning. I want to see how it works and then I want to sort of enlarge it." So, the man was very receptive to things of that nature and that probably is why we worked together. Some ideas that came to you, identity of view and identity of vision and identity in the process of making.

Sharma: He was receptive to new ideas.

Krishnamachari: He was always receptive. You could always go to him. I could go to him and tell him. He would discuss it with you or he would say go ahead.

Sharma: What was his understanding of economic and financial problems facing the country?

Krishnamachari: Well, so far as financial xxxx

problems are concerned, he left it to the people who were concerned. Broad economic problems again are subjected to this consideration of equality, humanism, elimination of dominance by other people, getting yourself subject to some other country. These are all the factors which were there. Sometimes they helped a bit, sometimes they delayed the decision, but his broad acceptance of economic decisions was on that basis - how much good it would do to us, how would it strengthen us, how would it be good to the people.

Sharma: What was his picture of socialism?

Krishnamachari: His idea of socialism was not a communist idea. He believed in carrying the people with him. It was not a question of dictation from above. He was a democratic socialist, and sometimes he probably ran away with this institution of Panchayati Raj. Well, we had gone through that kind of things in various ways, may be win over them, and at some point or other we got stopped. But he was a socialist. Really he disliked ostentation, he disliked the expenditure, he disliked the high living and his sympathy was for the poor. He disliked

differentiations, class distinctions, and when he saw that somebody was really giving it up, it cheered him.

Sharma: But sometimes, during the time he was Prime Minister, did he try to lessen the expenditure on ministers?

Krishnamachari: Well, all the story that is being told now is just fictitious. The whole problem about it is this. A minister has to be provided with a house in Delhi because he has no house. He goes from somewhere. I was living in a government house. I do not think any house that I lived in x was very comfortable. Of course, salaries, I think, that probably was wrong; taking a salary which was not even adequate to live in Delhi. We were taking a salary of Rs.2,250 and very often many of them had two families. Everybody was not like me. I had no wife. I had no dependent at the time. So I could live. But the other people had dependents and all that sort of thing. I think the story that ministers live in great comfort and spend a lot of money is exaggerated. May be it is incidental because you have got to keep a house of that status.

You provide them with a big house where they stay. That is not a comfortable house. You have given him a car. What else could you do? They have got to have a car and most of the work that they do is public work. I had a car of my own and I was not using the office car. Whenever I had to go, I drove my car myself. I never had a driver. I did not ask the office driver to look into it because my car was looked after in the workshop. I think it is very highly exaggerated and I think it is wrong that the ministers should be so poorly paid. And that is the reason why somethings have gone wrong. Personally I think a minister should have a standard of living. They should also have a pension. If you say ministers should only be bachelors or widowers with no family ties and all that, your choice gets limited. Jawaharlal knew some of these things and then he was trying to put a check on electricity expenditure and things of this sort. Sometimes they are wasting, but I think, by and large, the complaint has no basis. He had to live in that house and it is a wrong thing that we did. I was not responsible and I did not want to interfere. Prime Minister's house should have been the Prime Minister's house. Jawaharlal Nehru would have resented your Jawaharlal

Nehru Memorial Museum more than any body else. I can say that. Somebody said this house was going to be set apart for a memorial for him. When we asked him, he said: "No, let it be the Prime Minister's house."

Sharma: What was his understanding of problems of finance?

Krishnamachari: So far as the nuances of finances are concerned, I do not think he ever bothered about them because they were not the ones, he thought he could understand. Economic policies, broad outline of them was his making - the Industrial Policy Resolution, economic objectives. Details had to be filled up by many of us. Take my budgets for 1956 and 1957. I had to submit a budget in 1956 and 1957. Jawaharlal was with me in all the things. This was the first time that there was a new type of budget. Jawaharlal was with me in the whole thing. He knew all about it. And I would also like to repeat my last budget with Jawaharlal in 1964. I had gone and explained it to him, got his signature on the budget and as he was ill, I said: "Could you stay there, my speech will take an hour and forty minutes." He said: "No, I must listen to it." He

came there. He took me to the House and sat there. He had a copy of the budget speech. He did not look into it. At the end of it, he told me: "TT, your voice is very good, it was ringing. The crowd was listening to you." And I felt very happy. I felt it was my budget. So, he was with you in it and he had enough understanding of what was being done. I can say that as minister of economics, finance, I carried him with me all through.

Sharma: Did he have a hand in making the budget, in advising?

Krishnamachari: We discussed. If I was doing anything new, I always went and discussed with him, excepting in 1964 when he told me: "Talk to Nanda and to Lal Bahadur." Otherwise it was simply he and Pantji and myself.

Sharma: What was his approach to religion?

Krishnamachari: Well, you have his 1954 statement. I also remember that in 1954, I was with him in Chidambaram. He went to the temple. I said, "You should take off your coat." He said, "I won't." He did not go in, and it was noted. But I saw a

change in him from about 1956-57. I think by the time he died, he had left off his agnosticism. He probably did believe that there was Something, that strong negative outlook had disappeared. Well, we often talked about books that we read. He asked me what I was reading at the time. I said I was reading Sri Aurobindo's lectures. He asked me to leave a copy of that book with him and next time I went, he said: "What attracted you to this set of lectures? Because you are a Vaishanavite and he thinks in the same way?" There must have been enough background knowledge, so far as he was concerned, to say that. Not something which he did not have. He returned the book to me. He had more gentle approach to other people's beliefs towards the last years of his life and conformism, so to say, to what other people did. You could put a tilak on his forehead, he would not be angry, and you could give a flower, he would take it. Things were slightly different.

Sharma: You would not be able to say what was the reason which....?

Krishnamachari: I cannot say. I do not know what he was doing. I do not know how he was working, how his mind was working.

Maybe solitude, maybe nearness to death, maybe a question of his realisation of his own purpose, sense of purpose. So many things that are said about him, I cannot be very definite, but I can certainly say that between 1954 and 1964, the change was significant. That is what I could see.

Sharma: Who were his closest advisers?

Krishnamachari: Well, I can only tell you about the advisers that he had after about 1948-49. Before that I did not know and he had such a wide variety of people knowing him, who came to him, when, what they did, I knew only about members of the Cabinet. I said that one man who had a tremendous influence over him, which he did not exert, was Pantji. Pantji never went against Jawaharlal, nevertheless he had an impact on him. Politically, as far as thereafter, I had same place like Pantji. Lal Bahadur was very close to him, though I think he was not as close to him as he seemed to be. Some of the words that he said towards the end of his life, he did not seem to have been very close. He must have had personal friends. No, it was very funny. I will tell you an incident. In 1954, there was strike in the Indian Iron & Steel, Burnpur and the labour leader,

Michael John had a strike and a lock-out. Jawaharlal told me, "Ask that man John to see me." John came and I took him to see him. He went home. He said, "You are doing this, you are messing up things," and all sorts of things. For about five minutes he was so bitterly critical of John. I felt a little embarrassed. He asked to see him and I brought him along. Jawaharlal was being exceedingly harsh to him. He looked at my face, "TT, don't think that I am being harsh on John or anything like that. John and I were jail-mates. We have been old friends, we have been jail-mates." So, I did not know that John was his jail-mate and he was being harsh to him, exceedingly harsh to him because of the proximity. I did not expect him to say that to a stranger. That sort of thing. There must have been a lot of people whom he knew and I did not come across them. I only knew the political side of him.

Sharma: What was his attitude towards the Opposition?

Krishnamachari: Well, he was a democrat. He believed in the Opposition. He believed that they should be taken into consultation. Sometimes, momentarily, he probably got a little angry. There used

to be angry words sometimes with Acharya Kripalani, sometimes with communists and sometimes with Swatantra members later on, but that was only momentary. But he did feel that, right or wrong, we had to take them into confidence, we had to tell them what was happening. He was a parliamentarian, a strict parliamentarian and he believed in Parliament. He attended Parliament. The day when the Parliament was there, and he was there, he was always in the House. Whenever he did not have something else to do, always came and sat there. He had a great respect for Parliament. Sometimes, in fact, he probably did not very much like what the presiding officers did, but his passion for Parliament was one of the mains part of Jawaharlal's parliamentary life.

Sharma: Would you say that sometimes he was intolerant towards the Oppositon?

Krishnamachari: No irritants.... They are there sometimes. They were not so bad then as they are today. Personal character assassination and all that only began towards the end of his life and embarrassing moments were created now and again, but I do not think he was intolerant. No. Intolerance was not a part of his make-up. It was not in his build-up,

it might have been momentary.

Sharma: How were his relations with the President?

Krishnamachari: Rajendra Babu was an old colleague. I think that fundamentally there was not much in common between them. You will get somebody to tell you about Jawaharlal during his time and Rajendra Babu. I think he kept himself aloof. Somebody can throw some light on his life there. But he was a very correct man towards Rajendra Babu. Then Rajendra Babu was a principal man at one time. The President really had no powers to make himself effective. I think Nehru did ask the Attorney-General once to define the powers of the President. The Attorney-General then, Motilal Setalvad, said the President had no powers.

With Radhakrishnan his relations were very good, very pleasant, very good, and Radhakrishnan, of course, never threw his weight about. xxxx All that people say here that in 1962 Radhakrishnan wanted the Prime Minister to do this and there was a talk of the President taking over and all that by foreign correspondents, is all bunkum. There was no such thing at all. Radhakrishnan was very

friendly and, well, I don't think he ever interfered with Jawaharlal. With the two Presidents, this is how it went on. Actually, area of conflict did not develop. Even with Rajendra Babu, he asked the Attorney-General for his views; he did nothing more thereafter.

Sharma: Would you tell us what were his views about Acts like the Preventive Detention Act, which are restrictive of personal liberty?

Krishnamachari: The amendment of the Constitution in respect of Preventive Detention Act was made and the Preventive Detention Act was passed when the Sardar was there. I remember very well I was invited to a meeting of the party executive and I mentioned that some clauses of the Preventive Detention Act would be shot down by the Supreme Court. The Sardar said: "The Attorney-General has given his opinion." "The Attorney-General may, but I am here, as Member of Parliament, and if you ask me, I think it will be shot down." It was very funny. Jawaharlal kept quiet. After it was actually shot down, I remember he came and told me: "TTK, you told like that." Well, he did not like it very much, but it had to be done. Any question of any infringement of personal rights

did not find favour with Jawaharlal, but when officials came and told him, colleagues came and told him, yes he kept in that position, but you know inside of what he was thinking. He did not like it, he did not like it.

<u>Sharma</u>: But it continued even after the Sardar's death.

<u>Krishnamachari</u>: It was continued because it was part of the machinery of government and make-up. It cannot be helped. If there were any individual instances, we went to him, told him to do something about them. If there was any question of injustice or thing like that, you had him on your side.

<u>Sharma</u>: What were the differences which later on came between Abdullah and Panditji?

<u>Krishnamachari</u>: That I cannot tell you. That is something which I do not know. I only knew Abdullah rather well towards the last days of Jawaharlal because when he came back, I was the contact man for him. He was spending some time with me and Jawaharlal encouraged that. Jawaharlal said: "Well, Abdullah seems to like you, keep in touch with him." Of course, a few days later he died and I was trying

to bring round Abdullah, but the initial break up - I was not familiar with.

<u>Sharma:</u> What is your philosophy of life?

<u>Krishnamachari:</u> Broadly, I can flatter myself and say my philosophy of life is that of the <u>Geeta</u> - कर्म ण्येवा धिकारस्ते माफलेषु

action is thy duty, मा कर्मफल हेतू भूर्मा the fruit is not thy concern.

<u>Sharma:</u> If I may say so, what has made you so sour and indifferent to life?

<u>Krishnamachari:</u> What do you expect from life? I am not sour about life. I am a person who can laugh, on the softer side of it; I am a person who likes music. I have got a very large number of friends and that boy, he is employed here, he said, "<u>Mama</u> is here." The <u>Mama</u> he referred to was me. I am not very sour. Life ultimately is futile. There is nothing in it. We do not know where we come from; we do not know where we go. It is very difficult to say where you are going. I am not a sour person by temperament. No. I am a cheerful person. But certain things have no value for me. My sense of values is different.

Sharma: And what are they?

Krishnamachari: My sense of value is that nothing mundane seems to have any eternal value at all. I can say I have worked in politics, I have been a minister for 10 years, I tried to reshape the country's life. It has all gone to nought. I wanted to do something for the poor, but I was not permitted to do it. Vested interests drove me out. Now the people, who are supposed to be against this principle, do not want rational people like me. My philosophy is like this. "You had an opportunity to do something, you did something. Well, the fruits of it are not your concern."

Sharma: And this sort of ideas, how old are they?

Krishnamachari: I do not know. It must have been pretty old. I lost my wife when I was 31. I did not think of marrying again. So, my idea of not having a family life, nor having a home, goes back to 1931. I was making some money, and then I came into politics, did something. Well, I am out of it all now. I am just waiting for my end when it comes.

Sharma: Now, the disappointments in

political life, did they have any effect on you?

Krishnamachari: No, except for the fact that I was prevented from doing certain things which I wanted to do. That, of course, hurt me. I wanted to do something for the people, I wanted to make my country big. I have dabbled practically in all spheres of administration excepting perhaps education. That is the other thing. I knew all about administration; my writ ran. Somebody came and said: "Sir, I can't get this done." I rang up the particular person: "Why is it not done?" I was not the Prime Minister but my writ ran. I have not been let down excepting in one case. Only one civil servant let me down; no civil servant ever let me down. People who worked with me never let me down. I commanded their loyalty. Only in one case I was let-down.

Sharma: And that was a major let-down.

Krishnamachari: It was a major let-down. I trusted the man and he let me down. Well there it was, an incident.

Sharma: Do you think that was deliberate?

Krishnamachari: I do not know, we do not know.

It might have been accidental. He probably felt like doing something. He probably felt I had to be kept away from it. You can read it but you do not know what happened at that time. But anyway it was a let-down. But by and large, for instance, you mentioned about Iengar. I don't think Iengar and I agreed on everything. No. But we worked together, ~~worked together~~ and we were good friends, still remain friends.

Sharma: What were your plans to make this country big and prosperous?

Krishnamachari: I started off in 1953-54. I wanted this country to become a big producer of steel. I was really thinking of 30 millions in 1975 and that was the basis, the way we should go up, and I wanted a system of social security ultimately. I wanted the country to be militarily strong. It could all be done, could have been done, but it was broken. First thing was broken because I had to get out of government. The second thing was broken because of Jawaharlal's death. He was the guiding hand, he was the umbrella under which I worked. I am not sour, but sense of values do go on changing. I am no longer what I considered myself to be in 1945 or 1946, when

you thought you could do something. Now you know your powers.

Sharma: This change came in the 60s?

Krishnamachari: Well, upto 1958 I never thought of anything. There was no time for introspection. In 1958 I left the government ~~and went~~ and went and stayed in Kodaikanal for about a year-and-a half, or a little more, maybe till the end of 1959, living alone, communing with trees and forest.

Sharma: So that was the starting point?

Krishnamachari: Well, that was the starting point of, perhaps, humanising influence, yes.

Sharma: And then you again came into the government.

Krishnamachari: I came in because of Jawaharlal. He said: "We have to do something." He told me on the telephone, the day was 19th of January, 1962. He said: "This is my last term, we must do something, you must come back."

Sharma: And that introspection was interrupted at this time, will you say that?

Krishnamachari: I was not willing to come back, wanted a lot of persuasion. He sent word to me, he wrote to me, asked people to tell me, but I would not budge, until he came directly on the telephone and said: "This is my last term, we should do something for a go and you have to come back. The important thing is that you should be in Delhi."

Sharma: After his death what made you continue?

Krishnamachari: A very foolish, one of my follies in life. I should have left. Lal Bahadur said he would not accept the Prime Ministership if I refused to serve on the Cabinet. He said: "I do not know anything. I have to depend on you." I took him at his face value.

Sharma: What was the reason for breach with him?

Krishnamachari: There was no reason for breach with him excepting that he found that I was an irritant, far too self-sufficient and doing everything myself ....

Sharma: And that led to your resignation?

Krishnamachari: Well, I had to get out. I wanted to get out earlier but.... Anyway, he did not live. What would have happened if he had lived; we would have come together again, we would not have come together and all that, nobody knows definitely. He did not give a chance. He died.

Sharma: And after that again....

Krishnamachari: After that, well I was keeping in sort of a touch with this lady for 10 months but I knew there was no use. I withdrew from politics altogether.

Sharma: You withdrew not only from the politics but probably from the world itself?

Krishnamachari: The real position was, from 1939 my life was politics. I had no other life outside politics, no other interest outside politics, there was purpose in politics. I wanted to do something for my country. In those days we thought we were going to get independence and when we got independence we had got to be a big people, our people had to benefit by that. Well, when you withdrew from politics, you withdrew from life. Now, I do not want to come into politics because I am interested in

the Prime Minister. She happens to be the daughter of a friend, and if you cannot do good, do not do any harm, keep quiet. You can still be in the limelight. You can address meetings, some people will listen to you, some people will say, "Yes, you are saying the right thing." But that does not help, negative. I do not believe in negative action, mere criticism is of no use at all unless you are going to do something, make people do something about it, no point in merely being an agitator.

Sharma: Besides politics, have religion and spiritualism been a dominant influence in your life?

Krishnamachari: Well, my father was a very orthodox man. He brought his son up in an orthodox way. I learnt Sanskrit since I was five, I have done Veda-adhyayan for eight years. I know some of the Upanishads by heart. I was trained as a priest, I can function as a priest, but I have forgotten it now, for both good and evil. The background was there, maybe I rebelled against it initially, probably I came back to it again. After I lost my wife, I went back to it again ~~fx~~ for a period of time. Then by about 1941 when I gave up my business completely, I

disconnected myself from life altogether. I do not participate in any ceremony, I am a patit. I do not go and do anything which is sanyam, I do not pray for anything to God, No. I do not do xx archana to God in my name. No. I may probably be committing sins but I do not want to add up to my virtues, to merits. I take the usual rule, I just do not want anything for myself, as far as possible, avoid, keep control.

Sharma: So, fox as a matter of fact, you are a closed person?

Krishnamachari: I am not a closed person in that sense. I have told you I have got a lot of friends, lot of young friends, very beloved by them, affectionate, but there are not many people on my wave-length, the kind of talk that I could have with a man like Jawaharlal is no longer possible. That is why you go on raising your levels, you cannot find Jawaharlals to talk to these days.

Sharma: Or is it you take it that the way your plans in politics, your plans for economic development, they have not been appreciated?

Krishnamcahri: I never wanted an appreciation,

I never wanted an appreciation from my nation. I did not want a title. I did not want anything from them at all. I was so immersed in the action itself, action is the main thing. I may be able to do something. That was the main thing, not a question of somebody appreciating what you did. Somebody came and told me the other day: "We went to a funeral of a government servant. The people did not have enough money to have a funeral and the government had to give some money for it, and the widow has been given a pension and she said, 'Ah, it is all done by TTK'." He came and told me. So far so good, but it did not exhilirate me because I wanted to do much more, and I could not do it. In fact my attempt was to wipe the tears in every woman's eye.

Sharma: That was Gandhiji's idea.

Krishnamachari: That was my attempt, and so long I ~~remember~~ remained in power I was working all the time, I had no other distractions at all.

Sharma: Do you think the world has not done good by you?

Krishnamachari: I cannot say that. Who am I to judge? Who am I to judge? What is it that I deserved? But one thing I could say is India did not permit me

to do more things than what I have done. It is the prevention of action rather than recognition of my merit that I am perhaps sorry about.

<u>Sharma</u>: But what makes you think that the government is the only avenue for action?

<u>Krishnamachari</u>: That is the only avenue. I am a believer in state intervention. State is the only thing that can put things right. The old saying is there - <u>yatha raja tatha praja</u>. The government sets the attitudes of the people. You cannot escape it.

<u>Sharma</u>: This prevention, what you call prevention, has it shaped your attitudes towards the society and the country?

<u>Krishnamachari</u>: What is the attitude towards society? What good or evil can I do by having a different attitude? I am what you say non-ist, that means non-existent. I am a neutral person.